UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,811	12/21/2005	Tadamasa Toma	2005_1969A	2844

52349 7590 12/11/2008

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.
2033 K. STREET, NW
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,811	TOMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff Piziali	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *1* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *18 and 20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *15-17,19 and 21-29* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 December 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/11/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the figures.

Specification

3. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Election/Restrictions

4. ***Applicant's election of Species 1 (claims 15-17, 19, and 21-29)*** in the reply filed on 25 August 2008 is acknowledged and appreciated.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

5. ***Claims 18 and 20 are withdrawn*** from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 25 August 2008.

6. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claims 26 and 27, drawn to a media data display method (*claim 26*) and a media data display method (*claim 27*), classified in class 382, subclass 298 (*e.g., methods of scaling images*).

Group 2, claims 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, and 29, drawn to a media data display device (*claims 15-17 and 19*), a media data display device (*claims 21-25*), a media data display program (*claim 28*), and a media data display program (*claim 29*), classified in class 345, subclass 204 (*e.g., display control products*).

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

7. Inventions II and I are related respectively as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h).

(1) In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed (*in claims 26 and 27*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claims 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, and 29*).

For example, the process as claimed (*in claims 26 and 27*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claims 15-17 and 19*) not including at least:

"***a media data display device*** ***for displaying, on a display screen, multimedia data comprising a plurality of media including moving images, comprising:***," as claimed in independent claim 15 (*lines 1-2*);

"***a scaling determining unit operable to determine*** ***whether to display the moving images after changing their image size or to display the moving images without changing their image size***," as claimed in independent claim 15 (*lines 3-5*); and

"***a media data display unit operable to display*** ***multimedia data, the media data display unit displaying the moving images after switching whether to perform scaling or not based on a determination result from the scaling determining unit***," as claimed in independent claim 15 (*lines 6-8*).

For example, the process as claimed (*in claims 26 and 27*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claims 21-25*) not including at least:

"***a media data display device for displaying, on a display screen, multimedia data comprising a plurality of media including moving images, comprising:***," as claimed in independent claim 21 (*lines 1-2*);

"***a scaling unit operable to scale the moving images with respect to a moving image display area in which the moving images can be displayed in the display screen, based on scaling specifying information that specifies a method for scaling the moving images***," as claimed in independent claim 21 (*lines 3-5*); and

"***a media data display unit operable to display the multimedia data, the media data display unit displaying the moving images scaled by the scaling unit in the moving image display area***," as claimed in independent claim 21 (*lines 6-8*).

For example, the process as claimed (*in claims 26 and 27*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claim 28*) not including at least:

"***a media data display program for performing, with a computer, a media data display method for displaying, on a display screen, multimedia data comprising a plurality of media including moving images***," as claimed in independent claim 28 (*lines 1-3*); and

"***wherein the media data display program lets the computer perform a media display method***," as claimed in independent claim 28 (*lines 6-8*).

For example, the process as claimed (*in claims 26 and 27*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claim 29*) not including at least:

"***a media data display program for performing, with a computer, a media data display method for displaying, on a display screen, multimedia data comprising a plurality of media including moving images***," as claimed in independent claim 29 (*lines 1-3*); and

"***wherein the media data display program lets the computer perform a media display method***," as claimed in independent claim 29 (*lines 6-8*).

(2) In the instant case, the product as claimed (*in claims 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, and 29*) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (*of claims 26 and 27*).

For example, the product as claimed (*in claims 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, and 29*) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (*of claim 26*) without at least:

"***a media data display method for displaying, on a display screen, multimedia data comprising a plurality of media including moving images, comprising:***," as claimed in independent claim 26 (*lines 1-2*);

"***a scaling determining process of determining whether to display the moving images after changing their image size or to display the moving images without changing their image size***," as claimed in independent claim 26 (*lines 3-5*); and

"***a media data display process of displaying the multimedia data, the media data display process displaying the moving images based on a determination result from the scaling determining process***," as claimed in independent claim 26 (*lines 6-8*).

For example, the product as claimed (*in claims 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, and 29*) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (*of claim 27*) without at least:

"***a media data display method for displaying, on a display screen, multimedia data comprising a plurality of media including moving images, comprising:***," as claimed in independent claim 27 (*lines 1-2*);

"***a scaling process of scaling the moving images with respect to a moving image display area in which the moving images can be displayed in the display screen, based on scaling specifying information that specifies a method for scaling the moving images***," as claimed in independent claim 27 (*lines 3-5*); and

"***a media data display process of displaying the multimedia data, the media data display process displaying the moving images scaled by the scaling process in the moving image display area***," as claimed in independent claim 27 (*lines 6-8*).

8. The inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Any international application must relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (see MPEP 1850).

As demonstrated by the "***X***" and "***Y***" references on the International Search Report, at least one independent claim of the application does not avoid the prior art, therefore, the special technical feature of the application is anticipated by or obvious in view of the prior art.

Consequently, the inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

9. Moreover, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

12. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper

restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571)272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeff Piziali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629
3 December 2008